

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

BASRA D. MOHAMED,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

FULL LIFE CARE, et al.,

Defendant(s).

CASE NO. C22-1010-KKE

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
COMPEL

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants' motion to compel supplemental discovery responses from Plaintiff Basra Mohamed. Dkt. No. 64.

The parties met and conferred regarding alleged deficiencies in Mohamed's discovery responses on September 5, 2023, and at that time, Mohamed agreed to review, revisit, and supplement responses to certain interrogatories and requests for production no later than October 3, 2023. *See* Dkt. No. 65-4. Mohamed did not supplement her responses by that date, nor did she request additional time to do so. *Id.* After Defendants informed Mohamed on October 4 that they intended to file this motion to compel, Mohamed requested a meeting to discuss. *Id.* Defendants responded on October 20 and offered to meet the following week, and Mohamed did not respond. *Id.*

Defendants filed a motion to compel on October 24, 2023. Dkt. No. 64. Mohamed filed an opposition on November 17, 2023, the day the motion was noted and four days after her

1 opposition was due. *See* Dkt. No. 73. Mohamed's response is largely non-responsive, focusing
2 on issues not raised in or not relevant to Defendants' motion.¹ *Id.*

3 Because Mohamed's opposition to Defendants' motion does not directly dispute that her
4 previous discovery responses are deficient, and because the opposition was untimely filed and
5 Mohamed previously agreed to provide the supplemental discovery responses that Defendants seek
6 to compel, the Court GRANTS Defendants' motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
7 26(e)(1). Dkt. No. 64. Mohamed is hereby ORDERED to provide the supplemental responses to
8 Defendants' discovery requests that she previously agreed to provide, no later than January 31,
9 2024. *See* Dkt. No. 65-4 at 5-6. If the parties would find it useful to meet and confer before
10 Mohamed provides these responses, they are directed to do so with this deadline in mind.

11 Dated this 11th day of December, 2023.

12 

13 _____
14 Kimberly K. Evanson
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 _____
23 ¹ Defendants' reply asks the Court to strike Mohamed's opposition as untimely. Dkt. No. 74 at 6. In light
24 of the disposition of Defendants' motion, the Court finds it unnecessary to strike Mohamed's opposition. The Court
does, however, find it necessary to admonish Mohamed for her failure to comply with the briefing deadlines
pertaining to this motion as well as past motions. *See* Dkt. No. 49, 68. The Court is aware that Mohamed is
proceeding *pro se*, but she is nonetheless obligated to comply with court deadlines. *See, e.g., McVay v. Zebell*, No.
2:23-cv-01065, 2023 WL 7386457, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 8, 2023) (“[P]ro se litigants are still bound by the same
rules of procedure that govern other litigants[.]”). Future untimely filings may be stricken.